arXiv:0804.4548v1 [math.LO] 29 Apr 2008

INDESTRUCTIBLE COLOURINGS AND RAINBOW RAMSEY THEOREMS

LAJOS SOUKUP

Abstract. We show that if a colouring c establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_\omega$ then c establishes this negative partition relation in each Cohen-generic extension of the ground model, i.e. this property of c is Cohen-indestructible. This result yields a negative answer to a question of Erdős and Hajnal: it is consistent that GCH holds and there is a colouring $c : \bigl[\omega_2\bigr]^2 \longrightarrow 2$ establishing $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_2$ such that some colouring $g : \bigl[\omega_1\bigr]^2 \longrightarrow 2$ can not be embedded into c.

It is also consistent that 2^{ω_1} is arbitrarily large, and there is a function g establishing $2^{\omega_1} \not\to [(\omega_1, \omega_2)]^2_{\omega_1}$ but there is no uncountable g-rainbow subset of 2^{ω_1}.

We also show that if GCH holds then for each $k \in \omega$ there is a k-bounded colouring $f : \bigl[\omega_1\bigr]^2 \to \omega_1$ and there are two c.c.c posets $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$V^{\mathcal{P}} \models \text{“}f \text{ c.c.c-indestructibly establishes } \omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega_1;\omega_1)]_{k-bdd}\text{”},$$

but

$$V^{\mathcal{Q}} \models \text{“ } \omega_1 \text{ is the union of countably many } f\text{-rainbow sets ”}.$$

1. Introduction

Erdős and Hajnal observed, in [4], that if a graph G establishes $\omega_1 \not\to \bigl((\omega, \omega_1)\bigr)^2_2$ then G is universal for countable graphs, i.e., every countable graph is isomorphic to a spanned subgraph of G. This result can not be generalized for higher cardinals because of the following result of Shelah [9, Theorem 4.1]: *(a) Assume that κ, λ and τ are cardinals of cofinality greater than ω and G is a graph on κ. Then the property*

$(*)$ G establishes $\kappa \not\to ((\lambda, \tau))^2_2$

can not be destroyed by adding a single Cohen real, i.e. if $V \models (*)$ then $V^{Fn(\omega,2)} \models (*)$.

(b) *If you add a Cohen reals to some model V then in the generic extension*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E02, 03E35, 03E50, 05D10.

Key words and phrases. rainbow Ramsey, polychromatic Ramsey, indestructible, forcing, partition relations, Martin's Axiom.

The preparation of this paper was supported by the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research grant no. 61600 and 68262.

there is a graph C on ω_1 which is not isomorphic to any spanned subgraph of some graph G from V.

Learning this result Erdős and Hajnal raised the following question in [5, Problem 6.b]: *Assume that a graph G establishes $\omega_2 \not\rightarrow (\omega_1 \dotplus \omega)^2_2$. Do all graphs of cardinality $\aleph_1$ embed into G?*

We answer their question in the negative in theorem 2.4. The proof is based on theorem 2.2 which says that the property "*G establishes* $\omega_2 \not\rightarrow ((\omega_1;\omega))^2_2$" is indestructible by adding arbitrary numbers of Cohen reals to the ground model.

Given a colouring $f : \big[X\big]^n \longrightarrow C$ a subset $P \subset X$ is called *rainbow for f* (or *f-rainbow*) iff $f \restriction \big[P\big]^n$ is one-to-one. We also answer another question of Hajnal, [8, Problem 4.1], in the negative in theorem 2.6: it is consistent with GCH that there is a function f which establishes $\omega_2 \not\rightarrow [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_{\omega_1}$ such that there is no uncountable f-rainbow set.

In theorem 2.8 we show that it is also consistent that 2^{ω_1} is arbitrarily large, and a function g establishes $2^{\omega_1} \not\rightarrow [(\omega_1,\omega_2)]^2_{\omega_1}$ such that there is no uncountable g-rainbow set.

In the second part of the paper we deal with rainbow Ramsey theorems concerning "bounded" functions. A function $f : \big[X\big]^n \rightarrow C$ is *μ-bounded* iff $|f^{-1}\{c\}| \le \mu$ for each $c \in C$.

Let us recall some "arrow" notations:
$\lambda \rightarrow^* (\alpha)^n_{\kappa-\mathrm{bdd}}$ holds iff for every κ-bounded colouring of $\big[\lambda\big]^n$ there is a rainbow set of order type α,
$\lambda \rightarrow^* [(\alpha;\beta)]_{\kappa-\mathrm{bdd}}$ holds iff for every κ-bounded colouring c of $\big[\lambda\big]^2$ there is a set $A \subset \lambda$ of order type α and there is a set $B \subset \lambda$ of order type β such that $\sup A \le \sup B$ and $|[A;B] \cap c^{-1}\{\xi\}| < \kappa$ for each $\xi \in \operatorname{ran} c$, where $[A;B] = \{\{\alpha,\beta\} : \alpha \in A, \beta \in B, \alpha < \beta\}$.

Clearly $\lambda \rightarrow^* (\alpha)^2_{\kappa-\mathrm{bdd}}$ implies $\lambda \rightarrow^* [(\alpha;\alpha)]_{\kappa-\mathrm{bdd}}$.

We say that a function f *c.c.c-indestrictibly establishes the negative partition relation* $\Phi \not\rightarrow^* \Psi$ iff

$$V^P \models \text{“}f \text{ establishes } \Phi \not\rightarrow^* \Psi\text{ ”}$$

for each c.c.c poset P.

Since $\omega_1 \rightarrow (\alpha)^2_2$ holds for $\alpha < \omega_1$ by [3], and it was proved by Galvin, [6], that $\lambda \rightarrow (\alpha)^n_k$ implies $\lambda \rightarrow^* (\alpha)^n_{k-\mathrm{bdd}}$, we have $\omega_1 \rightarrow^* (\alpha)^2_{2-bdd}$ for $\alpha < \omega_1$. Moreover, Galvin, [6], showed that

Theorem. *CH implies that $\omega_1 \not\rightarrow^* (\omega_1)^2_{2-bdd}$.*

On the other hand, Todorcevic, [11], proved that

Theorem. *PFA implies that $\omega_1 \rightarrow^* (\omega_1)^2_{2-bdd}$.*

Abraham, Cummings and Smyth showed that $MA_{\aleph_1}$ is not enough to get $\omega_1 \to^* (\omega_1)^2_{2-bdd}$. More precisely, they proved the following theorem:

Theorem ([1, Theorem 3]). *It is consistent that there is a function* $c : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ *which c.c.c-indestructibly establishes* $\omega_1 \not\to^* (\omega_1)^2_{2-bdd}$.

They also showed that the property "*c establishes* $\omega_1 \not\to^* (\omega_1)^2_{2-bdd}$" is not automatically c.c.c-indestructible:

Theorem ([1, Theorem 4]). *If CH holds and there is a Suslin-tree then there is a function* $c' : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \longrightarrow 2$ *and there is a c.c.c poset* P *such that*
(a) c' *establishes* $\omega_1 \not\to^* (\omega_1)^2_{2-bdd}$,
(b) $V^P \models$ *there is an uncountable* c'*-rainbow set.*

We show that even the negative partition relation $\omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega_1;\omega_1)]_{k-bdd}$ is consistent with $MA_{\aleph_1}$ for each $k \in \omega$.

Moreover, Abraham and Cumming used two different functions in their theorems above. We show that a single function can play double role.

Theorem 1.1. *If GCH holds then for each* $k \in \omega$ *there is a* k*-bounded colouring* $f : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \to \omega_1$ *and there are two c.c.c posets* $\mathcal{P}$ *and* $\mathcal{Q}$ *such that*

$$V^{\mathcal{P}} \models \text{“} f \text{ c.c.c-indestructibly establishes } \omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega_1;\omega_1)]_{k-bdd} \text{”},$$

but

$$V^{\mathcal{Q}} \models \text{“ } \omega_1 \text{ is the union of countably many } f\text{-rainbow sets ”}.$$

2. On a problem of Erdős and Hajnal.

To formulate our results we need to introduce some notations. Given two functions $f : \left[X\right]^2 \longrightarrow C$ and $d : \left[Y\right]^2 \longrightarrow C$ we say that *d can be embedded into f*, ($d \Rightarrow f$, in short), iff there is a one-to-one map $\Phi : Y \longrightarrow X$ such that $d(\{y,y'\}) = f(\{\Phi(y),\Phi(y')\})$ for each $\{y,y'\} \in \left[Y\right]^2$.

Hajnal, [7], proved that it is consistent with GCH that there is a colouring establishing $\omega_2 \not\to (\omega_1 \dot{+} \omega)^2_2$. As it turns out, his argument gives following stronger result:

Proposition 2.1. *It is consistent that GCH holds and there is a function* $f : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ *establishing* $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_{\omega_1}$.

Since Hajnal's proof was never published we sketch his argument.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Define a poset $\mathcal{P} = \langle P, \le \rangle$ as follows. The underlying set P consists of triples $\langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi \rangle$ where $c : \left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega$ for some $\operatorname{supp}(c) \in \left[\omega_2\right]^\omega$, $\mathcal{A} \subset \left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\right]^\omega$ is a countable family and $\xi \in \omega_1$.

Put $\langle d, \mathcal{B}, \zeta \rangle \le \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi \rangle$ iff

(P1) $c \subset d$, $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$, $\xi \le \zeta$,
(P2) for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and for each $\beta \in (\operatorname{supp}(d) \setminus \operatorname{supp}(c)) \cap \min A$

$$\xi \subset d''[\{\beta\}, A].$$

Then $\mathcal{P}$ is a σ-complete, ω_2-c.c. poset and if $\mathcal{G}$ is the generic filter for $\mathcal{P}$ then $g = \cup\{c : \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi\rangle \in \mathcal{G}\}$ establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_{\omega_1}$ in $V[\mathcal{G}]$. $\square$

Proposition 2.1 validates the following question of Erdős and Hajnal, [5, Problem 6.b]: *Assume that a graph G establishes $\omega_2 \not\to (\omega_1 \dot{+} \omega)^2_2$. Do all graphs of cardinality $\aleph_1$ embed into G?*

To answer this question in the negative we prove a preservation theorem which makes us possible to apply Shelah's method from [9, theorem 4.1].

Theorem 2.2. *If $\mu \le \omega_1$ and c establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_\mu$ then $V^{Fn(\kappa,2)} \models$ "c establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_\mu$.*

Proof. The following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mu \le \omega_1$ and $c : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \mu$. The followings are equivalent:*
(1) c establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_\mu$,
(2) $\forall B \in \left[\omega_2\right]^\omega\ \forall \nu \in \mu$

$$|\{\alpha < \min B : \nu \notin c''[\{\alpha\}, B]\}| \le \omega,$$

(3) $\forall \mathcal{B} \in \left[[\omega_2]^\omega\right]^\omega\ \forall \nu \in \mu$

$$|\{\alpha < \min \cup\mathcal{B} : \exists B \in \mathcal{B}\ \nu \notin c''[\{\alpha\}, B]\}| \le \omega.$$

Assume on the contrary that the theorem fails. We can assume that we add just ω_1 many Cohen reals to V, i.e. $\kappa = \omega_1$. We can choose $\xi \in \omega_2$, $\nu \in \mu$, $p \in Fn(\omega_1, 2)$ and names $\dot{A}$ and $\dot{B}$ such that

$$p \Vdash \dot{A} \in \left[\xi\right]^{\omega_1} \wedge \dot{B} \in \left[\omega_2 \setminus \xi\right]^\omega \wedge \nu \notin c''[\dot{A}, \dot{B}].$$

We can assume that $\dot{B} \in V^{Fn(\omega,2)}$ and $\operatorname{dom} p \subset \omega$. For each $q \in Fn(\omega, 2)$ with $q \le p$ put

$$B(q) = \{\zeta : \exists r \in Fn(\omega, 2)\ r \le q \wedge r \Vdash \zeta \in \dot{B}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{B} = \{B(q) : q \in Fn(\omega, 2), q \le p\}$ and $A' = \{\alpha \in \omega_2 : \exists r \le p\ r \Vdash \alpha \in \dot{A}\}$. Then $A' \in \left[\xi\right]^{\omega_1}$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \left[[\omega_2 \setminus \xi]^\omega\right]^\omega$. Hence, by lemma 2.3, there is $\alpha \in A'$ such that $\nu \in c''[\{\alpha\}, B(q)]$ for each $q \in Fn(\omega, 2)$ with $q \le p$. Pick $s \in Fn(\omega_1, 2)$ with $s \Vdash \alpha \in \dot{A}$. Then $\nu \in c''[\{\alpha\}, B(s \restriction \omega)]$, i.e. there is $\beta \in \omega_2 \setminus \xi$ and $r \in Fn(\omega, 2)$ such that $r \le s \restriction \omega$ and $r \Vdash \beta \in \dot{B}$. Then

$$s \cup r \Vdash \alpha \in \dot{A} \wedge \beta \in \dot{B} \wedge \nu \notin c''[\dot{A}, \dot{B}],$$

but $c(\alpha, \beta) = \nu$. Contradiction. $\square$

Theorem 2.4. *For $2 \le \mu \le \omega_1$ it is consistent that GCH holds and there is a colouring $f : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \mu$ establishing $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_\mu$ such that $g \not\Rightarrow f$ for some colouring $g : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \longrightarrow 2$.*

Proof. By proposition 2.1 we can assume that in the ground model GCH holds and there is a function $f : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ establishing $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_{\omega_1}$.

If $\mu \le \omega_1$ and $\pi_\mu : \omega_1 \to \mu$ is onto then $f_\mu = \pi_\mu \circ f$ establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_\mu$.

Then, by [9, Theorem 4.1], in $V^{Fn(\omega,2)}$ there is a function $d : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \to 2$ such that $d \not\Rightarrow f_\mu$.

Since

$$V^{Fn(\omega,2)} \models f_\mu \textit{ establishes } \omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_\mu$$

by theorem 2.2, we are done. □

As it was observed by Hajnal, the construction of theorem 2.4 above left open the following question which he raised in [8, Problem 4.1]:

Problem. *Assume GCH holds and a colouring $c : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_{\omega_1}$. Does there exist a c-rainbow set of size ω_1?*

Before answering this question let us recall some positive results of Hajnal. In [8], he proved that

Theorem. *(1) If $f : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ establishes $\omega_1 \not\to [(\omega,\omega_1)]^2_{\omega_1}$ then $d \Rightarrow f$ for each $d : \left[\omega\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$.*
(2) If $f : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega$ establishes $\omega_1 \not\to [(\omega_1,\omega_1)]^2_\omega$ then there exists an infinite f-rainbow set.

When we colour the pairs of ω_1 we can not expect uncountable rainbow sets because of the following fact.

Proposition 2.5. *If CH holds then there is a function $f : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ such that*
(1) f establishes $\omega_1 \not\to [(\omega;\omega_1)]^2_{\omega_1}$,
(2) there is no uncountable f-rainbow.

Proof of proposition 2.5. Enumerate $\left[\omega_1\right]^\omega$ as $\{A_\alpha : \omega \le \alpha < \omega_1\}$ such that $A_\alpha \subset \alpha$. By induction on α, $\omega \le \alpha < \omega_1$, define $f(\xi,\alpha)$ for $\xi < \alpha$ such that

(1) $\alpha \subset \{f(\xi,\alpha) : \xi \in A_\beta\}$ for $\beta < \alpha$,
(2) $A_\beta \cup \{\alpha\}$ is not an f-rainbow for $\beta < \alpha$.

Then f satisfies (1) and (2). □

Next we answer [8, Problem 4.1] in the negative.

Theorem 2.6. *It is consistent that GCH holds and there is a function* $g : \left[\omega_2\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ *such that*

(1) g establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_{\omega_1}$*,*
(2) there is no uncountable g-rainbow.

Proof of theorem 2.6. The naive approach is to try to modify the order of the poset P from the proof of proposition 2.1 by adding a condition (P3) to the definition of the order:

(P3) for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and for each $\beta \in (\mathrm{supp}(d) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(c))$ the set $A \cup \{\beta\}$ is not a d-rainbow.

Unfortunately this approach does not work because the modified poset does not satisfies ω_2-c.c.

So we will argue in a different way.

Define the poset P as follows. The underlying set P consists of quadruples $\langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi, \mathcal{D}\rangle$ where

(i) $c : \left[\mathrm{supp}(c)\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega$ for some $\mathrm{supp}(c) \in \left[\omega_2\right]^\omega$,
(ii) $\mathcal{A} \subset \left[\mathrm{supp}(c)\right]^\omega$ is a countable family,
(iii) $\omega \le \xi < \omega_1$,
(iv) $\mathcal{D} \subset \left[\mathrm{supp}(c)\right]^\omega \times \omega_1$ is a countable family,
(v) $\forall \langle D, \sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{D}\ (\forall \gamma \in \mathrm{supp}(c))\ |\{\delta \in D : c(\gamma,\delta) < \sigma\}| = \omega$.

Put $\langle d, \mathcal{B}, \zeta, \mathcal{E}\rangle \le \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi, \mathcal{D}\rangle$ iff

(a) $c \subset d$, $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$, $\xi \le \zeta$, $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{E}$,
(b) for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and for each $\beta \in (\mathrm{supp}(d) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(c)) \cap \min A$

$$\xi \subset d''[\{\beta\}, A].$$

Clearly $\le$ is a partial order on P and $\mathcal{P} = \langle P, \le\rangle$ is σ-complete.

Lemma 2.7. $\mathcal{P}$ *is* ω_2*-c.c.*

Proof of the lemma. We say that two conditions, $p = \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi, \mathcal{D}\rangle$ and $p' = \langle c', \mathcal{A}', \xi', \mathcal{D}'\rangle$, are *twins* iff there is an order preserving bijection $\varphi : \mathrm{supp}(c) \longrightarrow \mathrm{supp}(c')$ such that

(1) $K = \mathrm{supp}(c) \cap \mathrm{supp}(c')$ is an initial segment of both $\mathrm{supp}(c)$ and $\mathrm{supp}(c')$,
(2) $K < \mathrm{supp}(c) \setminus K < \mathrm{supp}(c') \setminus K$,
(3) $c(\xi,\eta) = c'(\varphi(\xi), \varphi(\eta))$ for each $\{\xi,\eta\} \in \left[\mathrm{supp}(c)\right]^2$,
(4) $\mathcal{A}' = \{\varphi'' A : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$,
(5) $\xi = \xi'$,
(6) $\mathcal{D}' = \{\langle \varphi'' D, \sigma\rangle : \langle D, \sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{D}\}$.

It is enough to show that if p and p' are twins then they have a common extension $q = \langle d, \mathcal{B}, \rho, \mathcal{E}\rangle$. Let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$, $\rho = \xi = \xi'$ and $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}'$.

We should define $d(\nu,\mu)$ for $\nu\in\operatorname{supp}(c)\setminus K$ and $\mu\in\operatorname{supp}(c')\setminus K$.

We enumerate all "tasks" as follows: Let

$$\mathcal{T}_0=\{\langle\beta,A',\zeta\rangle:\beta\in\operatorname{supp}(c)\setminus K, A'\in\mathcal{A}', A'\subset\operatorname{supp}(c')\setminus K,\zeta<\xi'\},$$

$$\mathcal{T}_1=\{\langle\gamma,\langle D',\sigma'\rangle,n\rangle:\gamma\in\operatorname{supp}(c)\setminus K,\\ \langle D',\sigma'\rangle\in\mathcal{D}'\setminus\mathcal{D},|D'\setminus K|=\omega,n<\omega\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_2=\{\langle\gamma',\langle D,\sigma\rangle,n\rangle:\gamma'\in\operatorname{supp}(c')\setminus K,\\ \langle D,\sigma\rangle\in\mathcal{D}\setminus\mathcal{D}',|D\setminus K|=\omega,n<\omega\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}_0\cup\mathcal{T}_1\cup\mathcal{T}_2$ is countable we can pick pairwise distinct ordinals $\{\eta_x:x\in\mathcal{T}\}$ such that

(a) if $x=\langle\beta,A',\zeta\rangle\in\mathcal{T}_0$ then $\eta_x\in A'$,
(b) if $x=\langle\gamma,\langle D',\sigma'\rangle,n\rangle\in\mathcal{T}_1$ then $\eta_x\in D'\setminus K$,
(c) if $x=\langle\gamma',\langle D,\sigma\rangle,n\rangle\in\mathcal{T}_2$ then $\eta_x\in D\setminus K$.

Choose a function $d:\left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\cup\operatorname{supp}(c')\right]^2\longrightarrow\omega_1$ such that

(1) $d\supset c\cup c'$,
(2) $d(\beta,\eta_x)=\zeta$ for $x=\langle\beta,A',\zeta\rangle\in\mathcal{T}_0$,
(3) $d(\gamma,\eta_x)=0$ for $x=\langle\gamma,\langle D',\sigma'\rangle,n\rangle\in\mathcal{T}_1$,
(4) $d(\gamma',\eta_x)=0$ for $x=\langle\gamma',\langle D,\sigma\rangle,n\rangle\in\mathcal{T}_2$.

Let $q=\langle d,\mathcal{B},\eta,\mathcal{E}\rangle$. To show $q\in P$ we should check only condition (v). So let $\langle D,\sigma\rangle\in\mathcal{E}$ and $\gamma\in\operatorname{supp}(d)$. Assume that $\langle D,\sigma\rangle\in\mathcal{D}$. (The case $\langle D,\sigma\rangle\in\mathcal{D}'$ is similar.)

If $\gamma\in\operatorname{supp}(c)$ then $d\restriction[\{\gamma\},D]=c\restriction[\{\gamma\},D]$ so we are done. So we can assume that $\gamma\in\operatorname{supp}(c')\setminus K$.

If $D\setminus K$ is finite then the set

$$E=\{\delta\in D\cap K:c(\delta,\varphi^{-1}(\gamma))<\sigma\}$$

is infinite because $p\in P$ satisfies (v) and for each $\delta\in E$ we have $d(\delta,\gamma)=c'(\delta,\gamma)=c'(\varphi(\delta),\gamma)=c(\delta,\varphi^{-1}(\gamma))<\sigma$. So we can assume that $D\setminus K$ is infinite.

In this case $x_n=\langle\gamma,\langle D,\sigma\rangle,n\rangle\in\mathcal{T}_2$ for $n\in\omega$, so $d(\gamma,\eta_{x_n})=0<\sigma$ and $\{\eta_{x_n}:n\in\omega\}\in\left[D\right]^\omega$.

So $q\in P$.

It is straightforward that $q\le p$ because no instances of (b) should be checked.

Finally we verify $q\le p'$. Since condition (a) is clear, assume that $A'\in\mathcal{A}'$ and $\beta\in\operatorname{supp}(c)\setminus K$ with $\beta<\min A'$. Since $\sup K<\beta$ we have $A'\subset\operatorname{supp}(c')\setminus K$. Hence for each $\zeta<\xi$ we have $x=\langle\beta,A',\zeta\rangle\in\mathcal{T}_0$ so $d(\beta,\eta_x)=\zeta$. Thus $\xi\subset d''[\{\beta\},A']$.

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the generic filter for $\mathcal{P}$ and put $g = \cup\{c : \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi\rangle \in \mathcal{G}\}$.

Claim: *g establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1;\omega)]^2_{\omega_1}$ in $V[\mathcal{G}]$.*

Indeed, let $p = \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi, \mathcal{D}\rangle \in P$. If $A \in \left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\right]^{\omega}$ and $\eta \in \omega_1$ then $p' = \langle c, \mathcal{A} \cup \{A\}, \max(\xi,\eta), \mathcal{D}\rangle \leq p$ and for each $\beta \in \min A \setminus \operatorname{supp}(c)$

$$p' \Vdash \eta \subset g''[\{\beta\}, A].$$

Claim: *There is no uncountable g-rainbow set in $V[\mathcal{G}]$.*

Indeed, assume that $p_0 \Vdash \dot{X} \in \left[\omega_2\right]^{\omega_1}$. Since $\mathcal{P}$ is σ-complete there are $p \leq p_0$, $p = \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi, \mathcal{D}\rangle$, and $D \in \left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\right]^{\omega}$ such that $p \Vdash D \subset \dot{X}$. Let $p' = \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi, \mathcal{D} \cup \{\langle D, (\sup \operatorname{ran}(c)) + 1\rangle\}.\rangle$. Then $p' \in P$ and $p' \leq p$. Moreover

$$p' \Vdash \dot{X} \text{ is not a } g\text{-rainbow}.$$

Indeed, work in $V[\mathcal{G}]$, where $p' \in \mathcal{G}$. Write $X = \{\xi_\nu : \nu \in \omega_1\}$. Then for each $\nu < \omega$ there is $\gamma_\nu < \sup \operatorname{ran}(c) + 1$ and $\delta_\nu \in D$ with $g(\delta_\nu, \xi_\nu) = \gamma_\nu$. Then there are $\nu < \mu < \omega_1$ with $\gamma_\nu = \gamma_\mu$. Then $g(\delta_\nu, \xi_\nu) = \gamma_\nu = \gamma_\mu = g(\delta_\mu, \xi_\mu)$ and $\xi_\nu \neq \xi_\mu$, i.e. X is not a g-rainbow.

So, by the claims above, g satisfies the requirements of the theorem. $\square$

Baumgartner proved that if CH holds, $P = Fn(\left[\kappa\right]^2, \omega_1; \omega_1)$ for some cardinal $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, and $\mathcal{G}$ is the generic filter above P, then the function $g = \cup\mathcal{G}$ establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1, \omega_2)]^2_{\omega_1}$. We prove a related result here.

Theorem 2.8. *If CH holds and $\kappa \geq \omega_2$ is a cardinal then there is a σ-complete, ω_2-c.c. poset P such that in V^P there is a function $g : \left[\kappa\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ such that*

(1) g establishes $\kappa \not\to [(\omega_1, \omega_2)]^2_{\omega_1}$.

(2) there is no uncountable g-rainbow subset of κ.

Proof. Define the poset P as follows. The underlying set P consists of pairs $\langle c, \mathcal{D}\rangle$ where

(i) $c : \left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega$ for some $\operatorname{supp}(c) \in \left[\kappa\right]^{\omega}$,

(ii) $\mathcal{D} \subset \left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\right]^{\omega} \times \omega_1$ is a countable family,

(iii) $\forall \langle D, \sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{D}$ $(\forall \gamma \in \operatorname{supp}(c))$ $|\{\delta \in D : c(\gamma, \delta) < \sigma\}| = \omega$.

Put $\langle d, \mathcal{E}\rangle \leq \langle c, \mathcal{D}\rangle$ iff $c \subset d$ and $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{E}$.

Then $\leq$ is a partial order, and $\mathcal{P}$ is σ-complete.

We say that two conditions, $p = \langle c, \mathcal{D}\rangle$ and $p' = \langle c', \mathcal{D}'\rangle$, are *twins* iff there is an order preserving bijection $\varphi : \operatorname{supp}(c) \longrightarrow \operatorname{supp}(c')$ such that

(1) $\varphi(\xi) = \xi$ for $\xi \in \operatorname{supp}(c) \cap \operatorname{supp}(c')$,

(2) $c(\xi, \eta) = c'(\varphi(\xi), \varphi(\eta))$ for each $\{\xi, \eta\} \in \left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\right]^2$,

(3) $\mathcal{D}' = \{\langle \varphi'' D, \sigma\rangle : \langle D, \sigma\rangle \in \mathcal{D}\}$.

Lemma 2.9. *Assume that* $p = \langle c, \mathcal{D} \rangle$, $p' = \langle c', \mathcal{D}' \rangle$ *are twins. Let* $q \le p$, $q = \langle d, \mathcal{E} \rangle$, *such that* $\operatorname{supp}(d) \cap \operatorname{supp}(c') = \operatorname{supp}(c) \cap \operatorname{supp}(c')$. *Let* $A \in \big[\operatorname{supp}(d) \setminus \operatorname{supp}(c')\big]^{\omega}$, $\xi \in \operatorname{supp}(c') \setminus \operatorname{supp}(c)$ *and* $\rho < \omega_1$. *Then there is a common extension* $r = \langle c_r, \mathcal{D}_r \rangle$ *of* q *and* p' *such that* $\rho \subset c''_r[\{\xi\}, A]$.

Proof of the lemma. Write $K = \operatorname{supp}(c) \cap \operatorname{supp}(c')$ and fix the function φ witnessing that p and p' are twins. Let

$$\mathcal{T}_0 = \rho,$$

$$\mathcal{T}_1 = \{\langle \gamma, \langle D', \sigma' \rangle, n \rangle : \gamma \in \operatorname{supp}(d) \setminus K, \langle D', \sigma' \rangle \in \mathcal{D}', |D' \setminus K| = \omega, n \in \omega\},$$

$$\mathcal{T}_2 = \{\langle \gamma', \langle E, \sigma \rangle, n \rangle : \gamma' \in \operatorname{supp} c' \setminus K, \langle E, \sigma \rangle \in \mathcal{E}, |E \setminus K| = \omega, n \in \omega\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_0 \cup \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2$ is countable we can pick pairwise distinct ordinals $\{\eta_x : x \in \mathcal{T}\}$ such that

(a) if $x = \chi \in \rho$ then $\eta_x \in A$,
(b) if $x = \langle \gamma, \langle D, \sigma \rangle, n \rangle \in \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2$ then $\eta_x \in D \setminus K$.

Let $c_r \supset d \cup c_\nu$ such that

(i) $c_r(\eta_x, \xi) = \chi$ if $x = \chi \in \mathcal{T}_0$,
(ii) $c_r(\eta_x, \gamma) = 0$ if $\langle \gamma, \langle D, \sigma \rangle, n \rangle \in \mathcal{T}_0 \cup \mathcal{T}_1$.

To prove $r = \langle c_r, \mathcal{D}' \cup \mathcal{E} \rangle \in P$ it is enough to check condition (iii).

Assume first that $\langle D, \sigma \rangle \in \mathcal{D}'$.

If $\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}(c')$ then $c_r \restriction [\{\gamma\}, D] = c' \restriction [\{\gamma\}, D]$ so we are done. So we can assume that $\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}(d) \setminus K$.

If $D \setminus K$ is finite then $\langle \varphi^{-1} D, \sigma \rangle \in \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{E}$, and $D \cap K = \varphi^{-1} D \cap K$, so the set

$$H = \{\delta \in D \cap K : d(\delta, \gamma) < \sigma\}$$

is infinite because $q \in P$ satisfies (iii), and $H \subset \{\delta \in D : c_r(\delta, \gamma) < \sigma\}$.

So we can assume that $D \setminus K$ is infinite. In this case $x_n = \langle \gamma, \langle D, \sigma \rangle, n \rangle \in \mathcal{T}_1$ for $n \in \omega$, so $c_r(\gamma, \eta_{x_n}) = 0 < \sigma$ and $\{\eta_{x_n} : n \in \omega\} \in \big[D\big]^{\omega}$.

Assume now that $\langle D, \sigma \rangle \in \mathcal{E}$.

If $\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}(d)$ then $c_r \restriction [\{\gamma\}, D] = d \restriction [\{\gamma\}, D]$ so we are done. So we can assume that $\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}(c') \setminus K$.

If $D \setminus K$ is finite then $\gamma' = \varphi^{-1}(\gamma) \in \operatorname{supp}(c) \subset \operatorname{supp}(d)$ and $q \in P$ imply that the set

$$H = \{\varepsilon \in D \cap K : d(\varepsilon, \gamma') < \sigma\}$$

is infinite. But for each $\varepsilon \in H$ we have $c_r(\varepsilon, \gamma) = c'(\varepsilon, \gamma) = c(\varepsilon, \gamma') = d(\varepsilon, \gamma')$. So we can assume that $D \setminus K$ is infinite.

In this case $x_n = \langle \gamma, \langle D, \sigma \rangle, n \rangle \in \mathcal{T}_2$ for $n \in \omega$, so $c_r(\gamma, \eta_{x_n}) = 0 < \sigma$ and $\{\eta_{x_n} : n \in \omega\} \in \big[D\big]^{\omega}$.

So $r \in P$ and clearly $r \le q, p'$.

Finally for each $\zeta < \rho$ we have $\eta_\zeta \in A$ and $c_r(\xi, \eta_\zeta) = \zeta$. So $\rho \subset c''_r[\{\xi\}, A]$. $\square$

Lemma 2.10. *$\mathcal{P}$ is ω_2-c.c.*

Proof of the lemma. Since any family of conditions of size ω_2 contains two conditions p and p' which are twins we can apply the previous lemma to yield that p and p' are compatible in P. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the generic filter for $\mathcal{P}$ and put $g = \cup\{c : \langle c, \mathcal{A}, \xi\rangle \in \mathcal{G}\}$

Lemma 2.11. *g establishes $\omega_2 \not\to [(\omega_1; \omega_2)]^2_{\omega_1}$ in $V[\mathcal{G}]$.*

Proof. Assume that $p \Vdash \dot{X} = \{\dot{\xi}_\nu : \nu < \omega_2\} \in \left[\kappa\right]^{\omega_2}, \dot{Y} \in \left[\kappa\right]^{\omega_1}$.

For each $\rho < \omega_1$ we will construct a condition $r \le p$ such that $r \Vdash \rho \subset g''[\dot{X}, \dot{Y}]$.

Write $p = \langle c, \mathcal{D}\rangle$. For each $\nu < \omega_2$ pick $p_\nu = \langle c_\nu, \mathcal{D}_\nu\rangle \le p$ such that $p_\nu \Vdash \dot{\xi}_\nu = \xi_\nu$ for some $\xi_\nu \in \operatorname{supp}(c_\nu)$. Since CH holds there is $I \in \left[\omega_2\right]^{\omega_2}$ such that

(1) $\{\operatorname{supp}(c_\nu) : \nu \in I\}$ forms a Δ-system with kernel K,

(2) for each $\{\nu, \mu\} \in \left[I\right]^2$ the conditions p_ν and p_μ are twins.

Since P satisfies ω_2-c.c we can assume that $\xi_\nu \in \operatorname{supp}(c_\nu) \setminus K$ for $\nu \in I$.

Fix $\mu \in I$. Pick a condition $q \le p_\mu$, $q = \langle d, \mathcal{E}\rangle$, such that $q \Vdash Z \subset \dot{Y}$ for some $Z \in \left[\operatorname{supp}(d) \cap (\kappa \setminus K)\right]^{\omega}$. Choose $\nu \in I$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(c_\nu) \cap \operatorname{supp}(d) = K$.

By lemma 2.9 there is a condition $r = \langle c_r, \mathcal{D}_\nu \cup \mathcal{E}\rangle \in P$ such that $r \le q, p_\nu$ and $\rho \subset c_r''[\{\xi_\mu\}, Z]$. Then $r \Vdash \rho \subset c_r''[\{\xi_\nu\}, Z] \subset g''[\dot{X}, \dot{Y}]$. $\square$

Lemma 2.12. *There is no uncountable g-rainbow set in $V[\mathcal{G}]$.*

Proof. Indeed, assume that $p_0 \Vdash \dot{X} \in \left[\omega_2\right]^{\omega_1}$. Since $\mathcal{P}$ is σ-complete there are $p \le p_0$, $p = \langle c, \mathcal{D}\rangle$, and $D \in \left[\operatorname{supp}(c)\right]^{\omega}$ such that $p \Vdash D \subset \dot{X}$. Let $p' = \langle c, \mathcal{D} \cup \{\langle D, (\sup \operatorname{ran}(c)) + 1\rangle\}.\rangle$. Then $p' \in P$ and $p' \le p$. Moreover

$$p' \Vdash \dot{X} \text{ is not a } g\text{-rainbow.}$$

Indeed, work in $V[\mathcal{G}]$, where $p' \in \mathcal{G}$. Write $X = \{\xi_\nu : \nu \in \omega_1\}$. Then for each $\nu < \omega$ there is $\gamma_\nu < \sup \operatorname{ran}(c)+1$ and $\delta_\nu \in D$ with $g(\delta_\nu, \xi_\nu) = \gamma_\nu$. Then there are $\nu < \mu < \omega_1$ with $\gamma_\nu = \gamma_\mu$. Thus $g(\delta_\nu, \xi_\nu) = \gamma_\nu = \gamma_\mu = g(\delta_\mu, \xi_\mu)$ and $\xi_\nu \ne \xi_\mu$, i.e. X is not a g-rainbow. $\square$

So, by the lemmas above, g satisfies the requirements of the theorem.

$\square$

3. k-BOUNDED COLOURINGS

Definition 3.1. Let $X \in \left[\omega_1\right]^{\omega_1}$, $f : \left[X\right]^2 \to \omega_1$, $k \in \omega$.

(a) f is *k-bounded* iff $|f^{-1}\{\gamma\}| \le k$ for each $\gamma \in \operatorname{ran}(f)$.

(b) Put

$$\mathcal{D}^{(k)}(X) = \{D \in \big[[X]^k\big]^{<\omega} : d \cap d' = \emptyset \text{ for each } \{d, d'\} \in [D]^2\}.$$

(c) For $D \in \mathcal{D}^{(k)}(X)$ let

$$\operatorname{Hom}(D, f) = \{\alpha : \forall d \in D\ (\forall \delta, \delta' \in d)\ f(\delta, \alpha) = f(\delta', \alpha)\}.$$

(d) Given any cardinal μ let

$$\mathbb{D}^{(k)}_{\mu}(X) = \{\langle D_i : i < \mu\rangle \subset \mathcal{D}^{(k)}(X) : (\cup D_i) \cap (\cup D_j) = \emptyset \text{ for } i < j < \mu\}.$$

(e) f is an *$AR^{(k)}$-function* iff
  (i) f is k-bounded,
  (ii) for each $\langle D_i : i < \omega\rangle \in \mathbb{D}^{(k)}_{\omega}(X)$ there is $\gamma < \omega_1$ such that

$$X \setminus \gamma \subset \cup\{\operatorname{Hom}(D_i, f) : i < \omega\}.$$

Observation 3.2. *An $AR^{(k)}$-function $f : [\omega_1]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ establishes the negative partition relation $\omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega; \omega_1)]_{k-\mathrm{bdd}}$.*

Proof. Assume that $A \in [\omega_1]^{\omega}$ and $B \in [\omega_1]^{\omega_1}$. Pick pairwise disjoint sets $\{d_i : i < \omega\} \subset [A]^k$. Write $D_i = \{d_i\}$ and $\vec{D} = \langle D_i : i < \omega\rangle$. Since $\vec{D} \in \mathbb{D}^{(k)}_{\omega}(\omega_1)$ and f is an AR$^{(k)}$-function there is $\beta \in B$ such that $\beta \in \operatorname{Hom}(D_i, f)$ for some $i < \omega$, which means that $|f''[d_i, \{\beta\}]| = 1$. Since $d_i \in [A]^k$ we are done. ☐

Lemma 3.3. *If CH holds then for each $k \in \omega$ there is an $AR^{(k)}$-function $f : [\omega_1]^2 \to \omega_1$.*

Proof. The construction is standard. Let $\{C_\alpha : \omega \le \alpha < \omega_1\} \subset [\omega_1]^{\omega}$ be disjoint sets. Fix an enumeration $\left\langle \vec{D}_\alpha : \omega \le \alpha < \omega_1 \right\rangle$ of $\mathbb{D}^{(k)}_{\omega}(\omega_1)$ such that $\cup \cup \vec{D}_\alpha \subset \alpha$.

Let $\alpha < \omega_1$ be fixed. For each $\xi < \alpha$ pick $i_\xi \in \omega$ such that the sets $\{\cup(\vec{D}_\xi(i_\xi)) : \xi < \alpha\}$ are pairwise disjoint. Choose a function $g_\alpha : \alpha \to C_\alpha$ such that

($*$) $g_\alpha(\delta) = g_\alpha(\delta')$ iff $\{\delta, \delta'\} \in [d]^2$ for some $\xi < \alpha$ and $d \in \vec{D}_\xi(i_\xi)$.

For $\delta < \alpha$ let $f(\delta, \alpha) = g_\alpha(\delta)$. ☐

Theorem 3.4. *If GCH holds and $f : [\omega_1]^2 \to \omega_1$ is an $AR^{(k)}$-function then there is a c.c.c. poset P such that*

$$V^P \models f \text{ c.c.c-indestructibly establishes } \omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega_1; \omega_1)]_{k-\mathrm{bdd}}.$$

Although an AR$^{(k)}$-function establishes $\omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega; \omega_1)]_{k-\mathrm{bdd}}$ but there is no function which c.c.c-indestructibly establishes $\omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega; \omega_1)]_{k-\mathrm{bdd}}$ because Martin's Axiom implies $\omega_1 \to^* ((\omega, \omega_1))^2_{k-bdd}$.

Theorem 3.5. *If GCH holds and* $f : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \to \omega_1$ *is an* $AR^{(k)}$*-function then there is a set* $X \in \left[\omega_1\right]^{\omega_1}$ *and a c.c.c. poset* Q *such that*

$$V^Q \models X \text{ has a partition into countably many } f\text{-rainbow sets.}$$

Before proving the theorems above we need to introduce some notions.

Given a set x denote $\mathrm{TC}(x)$ the transitive closure of x. Let κ be a large enough regular cardinals, ($\kappa = (2^{\omega_1})^+$ works). Put $H_\kappa = \{x : |\,\mathrm{TC}(x)| < \kappa\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_\kappa = \langle H_\kappa, \in, \prec\rangle$, where $\prec$ is a well-ordering of H_κ.

Definition 3.6. (a) A sequence $\vec{N} = \langle N_\alpha : \alpha \in A\rangle$ of countable, elementary submodels of $\mathcal{H}_\kappa$ is called an *A-chain* iff $A \subset \omega_1$ and whenever $\alpha, \beta \in A$ with $\alpha < \beta$ we have $N_\alpha \in N_\beta$.
(b) Suppose that $\vec{N} = \langle N_\alpha : \alpha \in A\rangle$ is an A-chain and $Y \subset \omega_1$. We say that Y is *separated by* $\vec{N}$ iff for each $C \in \left[Y\right]^2$ there is an $\alpha \in A$ with $|N_\alpha \cap C| = 1$.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume that f is an $AR^{(k)}$-function. If $\langle N_m : m \leq n\rangle$ is an elementary $n+1$-chain, $f \in N_0$, $\vec{D}_0, \ldots, \vec{D}_{n-1} \in \mathbb{D}^{(k)}_\omega(\omega_1) \cap N_0$, and $\alpha_m \in N_{m+1} \setminus N_m$ for $m < n$ then the set*

$$\{i < \omega : \forall m < n \ \alpha_m \in \mathrm{Hom}(\vec{D}_m(i), f)\}$$

is infinite.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on n. So assume that the set

$$I = \{i < \omega : \forall m < n-1 \ \alpha_m \in \mathrm{Hom}(\vec{D}_m(i), f)\}$$

is infinite. (If $n = 1$ then $I = \omega$).

Write $I = \{i_j : j \in \omega\}$ and for each $\ell < \omega$ put

$$\vec{E}^\ell = \left\langle \vec{D}_{n-1}(i_j) : \ell \leq j < \omega \right\rangle.$$

Since f is $\mathrm{AR}^{(k)}$ and $\vec{E}^\ell \in \mathbb{D}^{(k)}_\omega(\omega_1)$, there is $\gamma_\ell < \omega_1$ such that

$$\omega_1 \setminus \gamma_\ell \subset \cup\{\mathrm{Hom}(\vec{D}_{n-1}(i_j), f) : j \in \omega \setminus \ell\}.$$

So if we take $\gamma = \sup\{\gamma_\ell : \ell < \omega\}$ then for each $\alpha \in \omega_1 \setminus \gamma$ the set

$$J_\alpha = \{i \in I : \alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}(\vec{D}_{n-1}(i), f)\}$$

is infinite.

Since $f, \vec{D}_0, \ldots, \vec{D}_{n-1}, \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-2} \in N_{n-1}$ we have $I \in N_{n-1}$ and so $\vec{E}^\ell \in N_{n-1}$ as well. Thus $\langle \gamma_\ell : \ell < \omega\rangle \in N_{n-1}$ and so $\gamma = \sup\langle \gamma_\ell : \ell < \omega\rangle \in N_{n-1}$ as well. Hence $\alpha_{n-1} \in N_n \setminus N_{n-1} \subset \omega_1 \setminus \gamma$ and so $J_{\alpha_{n-1}}$ is infinite.

But

$$J_{\alpha_{n-1}} = \{i < \omega : \forall m < n \ \alpha_m \in \mathrm{Hom}(\vec{D}_m(i), f)\},$$

so we are done. □

Proof of thereon 3.5. Let $\vec{N} = \langle N_\xi : \xi < \omega_1 \rangle$ be an ω_1-chain with $f \in N_0$ and let $X \in \left[\omega_1\right]^{\omega_1}$ be $\vec{N}$-separated.

Define the poset $\mathcal{Q} = \langle Q, \le \rangle$ as follows:

$$Q = \{q \in Fn(X, \omega) : q^{-1}\{n\} \text{ is } f\text{-rainbow for each } n \in \operatorname{ran} q\},$$

and let $q \le q'$ iff $q \supset q'$.

Lemma 3.8. *$\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies c.c.c.*

Proof of the lemma. Assume that $\{q_\nu : \nu < \omega_1\} \subset Q$.

Let $x_\nu = \operatorname{dom} q_\nu$, $L_\nu = \operatorname{ran} q_\nu$, and $x_{\nu,\ell} = q_\nu^{-1}\{\ell\}$ for $\ell \in L_\nu$.

We can assume that

(1) $\{x_\nu : \nu < \omega_1\}$ forms a Δ system with kernel x,
(2) $x < x_\zeta \setminus x < x_\xi \setminus x$ for $\zeta < \xi < \omega_1$,
(3) $L_\nu = L$ for each $\nu < \omega_1$,
(4) $q_\nu \restriction \left[x\right]^2 = q$ for each $\nu < \omega_1$,

For $\zeta \in \omega_1$ let

$$F(\zeta) = \{\xi < \omega_1 : f''[x_\zeta, x_\zeta \setminus x] \cap f''[x_\xi, x_\xi \setminus x] \ne \emptyset\}.$$

Since f is k-bounded, $F(\zeta)$ is finite, and so there is an F-free set $Z = \{\zeta_i : i < \omega_1\} \in \left[\omega_1\right]^{\omega_1}$.

For $x \in \omega_1$ let $\rho(x) = \min\{\nu : x \in N_\nu\}$. For each $\xi \in X$ pick $d_\xi \in \left[\omega_1\right]^k$ such that $\xi \in d_\xi$ and $\rho(\eta) = \rho(\xi)$ for each $\eta \in d_\xi$.

For $\zeta \in Z$ let $D_\zeta = \{d_\xi : \xi \in x_\zeta \setminus x\}$.

Let $\vec{D} = \langle D_{\zeta_i} : i < \omega \rangle$. Clearly $\vec{D} \in \mathbb{D}^{(k)}_\omega(\omega_1)$.

Since CH holds there is $\gamma < \omega_1$ such that $\vec{D} \in N_\gamma$.

Let $\zeta \in Z$ such that $N_\gamma \cap (x_\zeta \setminus x) = \emptyset$.

Apply lemma 3.7 for $n = |x_\zeta \setminus x|$, $\vec{D}_m = \vec{D}$ for $m < n$ and $\{\alpha_m : m < n\} = x_\zeta \setminus x$. Then, there is $i < \omega$ such that

$$(\forall m < n)\ \alpha_m \in \operatorname{Hom}(\vec{D}(i), f).$$

By the construction it means that

$$(\forall \eta \in x_\zeta \setminus x)\ (\forall \xi \in x_{\zeta_i} \setminus x)\ (\forall \delta \in d_\xi)\ f(\delta, \eta) = f(\xi, \eta).$$

Claim: $q_{\zeta_i} \cup q_\zeta \in Q$, i.e. f is 1–1 on $\left[x_{\zeta_i,\ell} \cup x_{\zeta,\ell}\right]^2$ for all $\ell \in L$.

Let $\xi, \eta, \xi', \eta' \in x_{\zeta_i,\ell} \cup x_{\zeta,\ell}$ with $\xi < \eta$ and $\xi' < \eta'$ such that $f(\xi, \eta) = f(\xi', \eta')$.

Assume first that $\{\xi, \eta\}, \{\xi', \eta'\} \in \left[x_{\zeta_i,\ell}\right]^2 \cup \left[x_{\zeta,\ell}\right]^2$. Since $q_{\zeta_i}, q_\zeta \in Q$ we can assume that $\{\xi, \eta\} \in \left[x_{\zeta_i,\ell}\right]^2 \setminus \left[x_{\zeta,\ell}\right]^2$ and $\{\xi', \eta'\} \in \left[x_{\zeta,\ell}\right]^2 \setminus \left[x_{\zeta_i,\ell}\right]^2$, (or $f(\xi, \eta) = f(\xi', \eta')$ implies $\{\xi, \eta\} = \{\xi', \eta'\}$). Then $f(\xi, \eta) \in f''[x_{\zeta_i}, x_{\zeta_i} \setminus x]$ and $f(\xi', \eta') \in f''[x_\zeta, x_\zeta \setminus x]$, so $\zeta_i \notin F(\zeta)$ implies $f(\xi, \eta) \ne f(\xi', \eta')$.

So we can assume that e.g. $\{\xi,\eta\}\notin\left[x_{\zeta_i,\ell}\right]^2\cup\left[x_{\zeta,\ell}\right]^2$, i.e. $\xi\in x_{\zeta_i,\ell}\setminus x$ and $\eta\in x_{\zeta,\ell}\setminus x$. But we know that

$$(\forall\delta\in d_\xi)\ f(\delta,\eta)=f(\xi,\eta).$$

Since f is k-bounded and $|d_\xi|=k$ we have

$$\big\{\{\xi',\eta'\}:f(\xi',\eta')=f(\xi,\eta)\big\}=\big\{\{\delta,\eta\}:\delta\in d_\xi\big\}.$$

But $d_\xi\cap(x_{\zeta_i,\ell}\cup x_{\zeta,\ell})=\{\xi\}$ because $\rho(\delta)=\rho(\xi)$ for each $\delta\in d_\xi$. Hence $f(\xi',\eta')=f(\xi,\eta)$ implies $\xi=\xi'$ and $\eta=\eta'$. □

Since $\{q\in Q:\xi\in\operatorname{dom}q\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{Q}$ for each $\xi\in X$ we have that if $\mathcal{G}$ is the generic filter in Q and $g=\cup\mathcal{G}$, then $\{g^{-1}\{n\}:n\in\omega\}$ is a partition of X into countably many f-rainbow sets, which completes the proof of Theorem 3.5. □

To prove theorem 3.4 we need some more preparation. We will use a black box theorem from [10].

Given a set K and a natural number m let

$$\mathrm{Fn}_m(\omega_1,K)=\{s: s\text{ is a function, }\operatorname{dom}(s)\in\left[\omega_1\right]^m,\operatorname{ran}(s)\subset K\}.$$

A sequence $\langle s_\alpha:\alpha<\omega_1\rangle\subset\mathrm{Fn}_m(\omega_1,K)$ is *dom-disjoint* iff $\operatorname{dom}(s_\alpha)\cap\operatorname{dom}(s_\beta)=\emptyset$ all $\alpha<\beta<\omega_1$.

Let H be a graph on $\omega_1\times K$, $m\in\omega$. We say that H is m-solid if given any dom-disjoint sequence $\langle s_\alpha:\alpha<\omega_1\rangle\subset\mathrm{Fn}_m(\omega_1,K)$ there are $\alpha<\beta<\omega_1$ such that

$$[s_\alpha,s_\beta]\subset H.$$

H is called *strongly solid* iff it is m-solid for each $m\in\omega$.

Black Box Theorem ([10, Theorem 2.2])**.** *Assume $2^{\omega_1}=\omega_2$. If H is a strongly solid graph on $\omega_1\times K$, where $|K|\le 2^{\omega_1}$, then for each $m\in\omega$ there is a c.c.c poset P of size ω_2 such that*

$$V^P\models\text{“}H\text{ is c.c.c-indestructibly }m\text{-solid.”}$$

The theorem above is build on a method of Abraham and Todorčevič from [2].

We need one more lemma before we can apply the Black Box Theorem above.

Lemma 3.9. *There is a function $r:\omega_1\to\omega$ such that for each $A,B\in\left[\omega_1\right]^{<\omega}$ if $r(A)=r(B)$ then $A\cap B$ is an initial segment of A and B.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a countable dense subset of the product space ω^{ω_1}. Moreover, for each $\alpha<\omega_1$ fix a function $f_\alpha:\alpha\xrightarrow{1-1}\omega$.

Let $A=\{\alpha_0,\dots,\alpha_{n-1}\}\in\left[\omega_1\right]^{<\omega}$, $\alpha_0<\dots\alpha_{n-1}$.

Pick $d_A \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $d_A(\alpha_i) = i$ for each $i < |A|$. Let

$$r(A) = \left\langle d_A, \left\langle f''_{\alpha_i}(A \cap \alpha_i) : i < |A| \right\rangle \right\rangle .$$

Since the range of r is countable it is enough to prove that if $r(A) = r(B)$ then $A \cap B$ is an initial segment of A and B.

Write $A = \{\alpha_i : i < m\}$, $\alpha_0 < \dots < \alpha_{n-1}$, and $B = \{\beta_j : j < m\}$, $\beta_0 < \dots \beta_{m-1}$.

Assume that $\alpha_i = \beta_j$. Then $d_A(\alpha_i) = i$ and $d_B(\beta_j) = j$. Since $d_A = d_B$ it follows that $i = j$. So $r(A) = r(B)$ yields $f''_{\alpha_i}(A \cap \alpha_i) = f''_{\alpha_i}(B \cap \alpha_i)$. Since f_{α_i} is 1–1 on α_i it follows that $A \cap \alpha_i = B \cap \alpha_i$. $\square$

We will use the following corollary of this lemma.

Corollary 3.10. *There is a function* $r : \omega_1 \longrightarrow \omega$ *such that for each* $A, B \in \left[\omega_1\right]^{<\omega}$ *if* $\min(A) \neq \min(B)$ *and* $r(A) = r(B)$ *then* $A \cap B = \emptyset$.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Let $\vec{N} = \langle N_\xi : \xi < \omega_1 \rangle$ be an ω_1-chain with $f \in N_0$. Fix the function r from corollary 3.10 above.

For $\xi \in \omega_1$ let $\rho(\xi) = \min\{\nu : \xi \in N_\nu\}$.

Let $K = \left[\omega_1\right]^k \times \omega_1 \times \omega$. For any function $c : \omega_1 \longrightarrow \omega_1$ define a graph H_c on $\omega_1 \times K$ as follows.

If $x, x' \in \omega_1 \times K$, $x = \langle \zeta, \langle d, \xi, m \rangle \rangle$, $x' = \langle \zeta', \langle d', \xi', m' \rangle \rangle$, $\zeta < \zeta'$, let $\{x, x'\}$ be an edge in H_c provided

IF

(1) $m = m'$,
(2) $\rho(\xi') = \zeta'$,
(3) $\zeta < \min d$,
(4) $r(\{\zeta\} \cup d) = m$,

THEN

(5) $c(\delta, \xi') = c(\varepsilon, \xi')$ for each $\delta, \varepsilon \in d$.

Lemma 3.11. *If* H_c *is* 1*-solid for some colouring* c *then* c *establishes* $\omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega_1; \omega_1)]_{k-b.d.d.}$.

Proof. We will show that for all $X = \{\xi_\beta : \beta < \omega_1\} \in \left[\omega_1\right]^{\omega_1}$ and for all disjoint family $\{d_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subset \left[\omega_1\right]^k$ there are $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1$ such that $\max d_\alpha < \xi_\beta$ and $|c''[d_\alpha, \{\xi_\beta\}]| = 1$.

By thinning out and renumerating of the sequences we can assume that

(1) $\rho(\xi_\alpha) < \min \rho'' d_\alpha < \max \rho'' d_\alpha < \rho(\xi_{\alpha+1})$ for $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$,
(2) $r(\{\rho(\xi_\alpha) \cup d_\alpha\}) = m$ for some $m \in \omega$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$.

Let $x_\alpha = \langle \rho(\xi_\alpha), \langle d_\alpha, \xi_\alpha, m \rangle \rangle$ for $\alpha < \omega_1$. Since the sequence $\langle \{x_\alpha\} : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ is dom-disjoint, and (1)-(4) hold for each $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$, there are $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$

such that (5) holds for x_α and x_β because H_c is 1-solid, i.e. $|c''[d_\alpha, \{\xi_\beta\}]| = 1$, which was to be proved. $\square$

Lemma 3.12. *If c is an $AR^{(k)}$-function and CH holds then H_c is strongly solid.*

Proof. Let $m \in \omega$ and $\langle E_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle \subset \mathrm{Fn}_m(\omega_1, K)$ be a dom-disjoint sequence.

Write $E_\alpha = \{x_{\alpha,i} : i < m\}$, $x_{\alpha,i} = \langle \zeta_{\alpha,i}, \langle d_{\alpha,i}, \xi_{\alpha,i}, n_{\alpha,i} \rangle \rangle$.

We can assume that

(i) $n_{\alpha,i} = n_i$,
(ii) $\rho(\xi_{\alpha,i}) = \zeta_{\alpha,i}$
(iii) $\zeta_{\alpha,i} < \min d_{\alpha,i}$,
(iv) $r(\{\zeta_{\alpha,i}\} \cup (d_{\alpha,i})) = n_i$,
(v) $\max \rho'' d_{\alpha,i} < \zeta_{\beta,j}$ for $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$ and $i, j < m$.

Let $N = \{n_i : i < m\}$. For $\alpha < \omega_1$ and $n \in N$ put $D_{\alpha,n} = \{d_{\alpha,i} : n_i = n\}$.

Claim: $D_{\alpha,n} \in \mathcal{D}^{(k)}(\omega_1)$.

Indeed, if $i \neq j < m$ and $n_i = n_j$ then $r(\{\zeta_{\alpha,i}\} \cup d_{\alpha,i}) = n_i = n_j = r(\{\zeta_{\alpha,j}\} \cup d_{\alpha,j})$ but $\min(\{\zeta_{\alpha,i}\} \cup d_{\alpha,i}) = \zeta_{\alpha,i} \neq \zeta_{\alpha,j} = \min(\{\zeta_{\alpha,j}\} \cup d_{\alpha,j})$ so $d_{\alpha,i} \cap d_{\alpha,j} = \emptyset$ by the choice of the function r.

(iii) and (v) together give $\max(\cup D_{\alpha,n}) < \min(\cup D_{\beta,n})$ for $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$ and $n \in N$.

Thus $\vec{D}'_n = \langle D_{\ell,n} : \ell < \omega \rangle \in \mathbb{D}^{(k)}_\omega(\omega_1)$.

Since CH holds there is $\gamma < \omega_1$ such that $\{\vec{D}'_n : n \in N\} \subset N_\gamma$. Pick $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that $N_\gamma \cap \{\zeta_{\alpha,j} : j < m\} = \emptyset$.

Let $\vec{D}_j = \vec{D}'_{n_j}$ for $j < m$.

We are going to apply lemma 3.7 as follows: $\vec{M} = \left\langle N_\gamma, N_{\zeta_j} : j < m \right\rangle$ is an elementary $m+1$-chain, $f, \vec{D}_0, \ldots, \vec{D}_{m-1} \in N_0$ and $\xi_{\alpha,j} \in N_{\zeta_j} \setminus N_{\zeta_{j-1}}$ for $j < m$, where $\zeta_{-1} = \gamma$. Hence, by lemma 3.7 there is $\ell < \omega$ such that for each $j < m$

$$\xi_{\alpha,j} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\vec{D}_j(\ell), f). \tag{$\circ$}$$

Claim $[x_\ell, x_\alpha] \subset H_c$.

Let $i, j < m$. We show $\{x_{\ell,i}, x_{\alpha,j}\} \in H_c$. (2)-(4) holds by the construction. If $n_i \neq n_j$ then (1) fails so we are done. Assume that $n_i = n_j = n \in N$. Then $d_{\ell,i} \in \vec{D}'_n(\ell) = \vec{D}_j(\ell)$. Thus

$$(\forall \delta, \delta' \in d_{\ell,i})\ f(\delta, \xi_{\alpha,j}) = f(\delta', \xi_{\alpha,j})$$

by ($\circ$). Hence (5) holds and so $\{x_{\ell,i}, x_{\alpha,j}\} \in H_c$. $\square$

Now we can easily conclude the proof of 3.4.

Let $f : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \to \omega_1$ be an $\mathrm{AR}^{(k)}$-function. By lemma 3.12, the graph H_f is strongly solid. Since GCH holds, we can apply our Black Box Theorem to find a c.c.c. poset P such that

$$V^P \models H_f \text{ is c.c.c-indestructibly 1-solid.}$$

But then, by lemma 3.11,

$$V^P \models f \text{ c.c.c-indestructibly establishes } \omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega_1;\omega_1)]_{k-b.d.d.}.$$

□

Proof of theorem 1.1. Since GCH holds, by lemma 3.3 there is an $\mathrm{AR}^{(k)}$-function $g : \left[\omega_1\right]^2 \longrightarrow \omega_1$. By theorem 3.5 there is a set $X \in \left[\omega_1\right]^{\omega_1}$ and a c.c.c. poset Q such that

$$V^Q \models \ X \text{ has a partition into countably many } g\text{-rainbow sets.}$$

Let $h : \omega_1 \longrightarrow X$ be a bijection and put $f = g \circ h$. Then

$$V^Q \models \ \omega_1 \text{ has a partition into countably many } f\text{-rainbow sets.}$$

Since f is an $\mathrm{AR}^{(k)}$-function as well, we can apply theorem 3.4 to obtain that

$$V^P \models \ f \text{ c.c.c-indestructibly establishes } \omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega_1;\omega_1)]_{k-\mathrm{bdd}},$$

fro some c.c.c. poset P, which proves the theorem. □

Lemma 3.3 and theorem 3.4 give immediately

Corollary 3.13. $\omega_1 \not\to^* [(\omega_1;\omega_1)]_{k-\mathrm{bdd}}$ *is consistent with Martin's Axiom.*

References

[1] Abraham, U; Cummings, J; Smyth, C; *Some results in polychromatic Ramsey theory.* J. Symb. Log. 72 (2007), no. 3, 865-896 .

[2] U. Abraham, S. Todorčevič, *Martin's Axiom and first countable S- and L-spaces*, Handbook of Set-Theoretical Topology, e.d. K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, 327–345, North-Holland, New York, 1984.

[3] Baumgartner, J; Hajnal, A; *A proof (involving Martin's axiom) of a partition relation.* Fund. Math. 78 (1973), no. 3, 193–203.

[4] Erdős, P; Hajnal, A; *Unsolved and solved problems in set theory.* Proc. Tarski Symp., internat. Symp. Honor Alfred Tarski, Berkeley 1971, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 25(1974), 269-287 .

[5] Erdős, P; Hajnal, A; *Embedding theorems for graphs establishing negative partition relations,* Period. Math. Hungar. 9 (1978) no. 3, 205–230.

[6] Galvin, F; letter to Todorcevic.

[7] Hajnal, A; unpublished note.

[8] Hajnal, A; *Rainbow Ramsey Theorems for Colorings Establishing Negative Partition Relations*, Fund. Math. 198 (2008), 255–262.

[9] Shelah, S; *Coloring without triangles and partition relations,* Israel J. Math. 20 (1975), 1-12 .

[10] Soukup, L; *Indestructible properties of S- and L-spaces.* Topology and its Application. 112 (2001), no 3, 245–257.
[11] Todorcevic, S; *Forcing positive partition relations.* Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 280 (1983), 703-720.

ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, BUDAPEST, V. REÁLTANODA UTCA 13-15, H-1053, HUNGARY
E-mail address: `soukup@renyi.hu`